New angular selection to improve soft opposite-sign dilepton+jets+MET signature from higgsino pair production at hadron colliders

Dibyashree Sengupta

National Taiwan University

in collaboration with Howard Baer, Vernon Barger and Xerxes Tata

Energy Frontier Workshop

September 01, 2021

Overview

1. The Standard Model and its drawbacks
2. SUSY as a BSM Theory
   - Naturalness
   - Radiatively-Driven Natural SUSY models
3. SUSY Signal and SM Backgrounds
   - New Angle cuts
   - Improved efficiency due to new Angle cuts
   - Mass reach
4. Conclusion

The Standard Model and its drawbacks

Although, the Standard Model is the most celebrated theory till date, it has certain drawbacks as follows :

- Existence of Dark Matter [LSP from RPC SUSY + QCD Axion]
- The Higgs mass instability problem in the EW sector [SUSY]
- Gravity, Dark energy, Cosmological Constant [Landscape]

SUSY as a BSM Theory

- Softly Broken supersymmetry or SUSY is a highly motivated extension of SM which obeys a new quantum symmetry which relates fermions to bosons.
- In SUSY, the SM fields are elevated to superfields containing both fermionic and bosonic components. Supersymmetrizing the SM leads to the MSSM.
- Quadratic Divergences in Higgs Mass due to each SM particle is cancelled by its *Superpartner*. This idea solves the Big Hierarchy problem which is one of the main motivations of SUSY.
- But **no** sparticles have been seen in LHC yet.

Naturalness

$$m_{sparticles} >> m_{SMparticles}$$

Unless the spectrum is compressed,

LHC Limits: $m_{\tilde{g}} > 2.2$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{t}_1} > 1.3$ TeV $\Longrightarrow$ **Is SUSY Unnatural?**

The notion of *Practical Naturalness* states that

> *An Observable $\mathcal{O}$ is natural if all independent contributions to $\mathcal{O}$ are comparable to or less than $\mathcal{O}$.*

The measure of Naturalness is the Electroweak fine-tuning parameter (Δ_{EW}) which is defined as

$$\Delta_{EW} = max_i|C_i|/(M_Z^2/2) \tag{1}$$

Where, C_i is any one of the parameters on the RHS of the following equation :

$$\frac{M_Z^2}{2} = \frac{m_{H_d}^2 + \Sigma_d^d - (m_{H_u}^2 + \Sigma_u^u)tan^2\beta}{tan^2\beta - 1} - \mu^2 \approx -m_{H_u}^2 - \mu^2 - \Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2}) \tag{2}$$

A SUSY model is said to be natural if $\Delta_{EW} < 30$. This choice $\Delta_{EW} < 30$ is not ad-hoc, rather it arises from anthropic requirements for life to sustain.

Naturalness



Top ten contributions to $\Delta_{EW} = max_i|C_i|/(M_Z^2/2)$ from NUHM2 model benchmark points with $\mu = 150$, 250, 350 and 450 GeV.

arXiv: 1509.02929 by Baer, Barger and Savoy.

arXiv: 1702.06588 by Baer, Barger, Gainer, Huang, Savoy, Serce and Tata.

Requiring $\Delta_{EW} < 30$ implies

- $\mu \leq 300$ GeV $\Longrightarrow$ Light higgsinos.
- top squarks must be highly mixed $\Longrightarrow$ $m_h \sim 125$ GeV.

Radiatively-Driven Natural SUSY models

- nNUHM2 Model *(Nucl.Phys. B435 (1995) 115-128; JHEP 0507 (2005) 065.)*
  m_0, $m_{1/2}$, A_0, tan β, μ, m_A
- nNUHM3 Model *(Nucl.Phys. B435 (1995) 115-128; JHEP 0507 (2005) 065.)*
  $m_0(1,2)$, $m_0(3)$, $m_{1/2}$, A_0, tan β, μ, m_A
- nGMM Model *(Phys. Rev. D 94 (2016) no.11, 115017.)*
  α, $m_{3/2}$, c_m, c_{m3}, a_3, tan β, μ, m_A
- nAMSB Model *(Nucl. Phys. B 557 (1999) 79; Phys. Rev. D 98 (2018) no.1, 015039.)*
  m_0, $m_{3/2}$, A_0, tan β, μ, m_A

Signal and Background processes

Despite large cross-section of pair production of higgsinos, the signal is swamped by backgrounds because the decay products are soft. Hence the focus is on monojet + soft dilepton + $\not{E}_T$ signal, triggered by monojet.



A generic feynman diagram for opposite-sign dilepton+jets+MET signature from higgsino pair production at hadron colliders

SM Backgrounds: $\tau\bar{\tau}j$, $t\bar{t}$, WWj, $W\ell\bar{\ell}j$, $Z\ell\bar{\ell}j$

Benchmark points

We have chosen 3 Benchmark points as follows:

- BM1 (NUHM2): $m_0 = 5$ TeV, $m_{1/2} = 1$ TeV, $A_0 = -8$ TeV, $tan\beta = 15$, $\mu = 150$ GeV, $m_A = 1$ TeV
  $\Longrightarrow m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} = 158.2$ GeV, $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 146.2$ GeV,
  $\Delta m = m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 12$ GeV, $\Delta_{EW} = 20.4$
- BM2 (NUHM2): $m_0 = 5$ TeV, $m_{1/2} = 1.05$ TeV, $A_0 = -8$ TeV, $tan\beta = 10$, $\mu = 300$ GeV, $m_A = 2$ TeV
  $\Longrightarrow m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} = 310.1$ GeV, $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 295.1$ GeV,
  $\Delta m = m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 15$ GeV, $\Delta_{EW} = 21.7$
- BM1 (GMM'): $tan\beta = 10$, $m_{3/2} = 75$ TeV, $\alpha = 4$, $c_m = c_{m3} = 6.9$, $a_3 = 5.1$, $\mu = 200$ GeV, $m_A = 2$ TeV
  $\Longrightarrow m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} = 207.0$ GeV, $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 202.7$ GeV,
  $\Delta m = m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 4.3$ GeV, $\Delta_{EW} = 26.0$

Signal and Background evaluation

- For simulations, we have used MadGraph5_aMC@NLO for event generation, interfaced with Pythia 8 for parton showering and hadronization, followed by Delphes 3.4.2 for detector simulation where the default Delphes ATLAS parameter card is employed.
- The anti-k_T jet algorithm has been used with $R = 0.6$. We consider only jets with $E_T(\text{jet}) > 40$ GeV and $|\eta(jet)| < 3.0$ in our analysis.
- We identify leptons with $E_T > 5$ GeV and $|\eta(\ell)| < 2.5$ as isolated leptons if if the sum of the transverse energy of all other objects (tracks, calorimeter towers, etc.) within $\Delta R = 0.5$ of the lepton candidate is less than 10% of the lepton E_T.
- We have used Isajet 7.88 to generate the Les Houches Accord (LHA) file for the signal BM points and pass it through the above-mentioned simulation chain.

Basic cuts and $C1$ cuts

Basic cuts (cuts at Madgraph level): $p_T(j) > 80$ GeV, $p_T(\ell) > 1$ GeV, $\Delta R(\ell\bar{\ell}) > 0.01$ and $m(\ell\bar{\ell}) > 1$ GeV for the backgrounds including $\gamma^*, Z^* \to \ell\bar{\ell}$

Next, we implement cut set **C1**:

- require two OS/SF isolated leptons with $p_T(\ell) > 5$ GeV, $|\eta(\ell)| < 2.5$,
- $n(jets) \geq 1$ with $p_T(j1) > 100$ GeV for identified calorimeter jets,
- $\Delta R(\ell\bar{\ell}) > 0.05$ (for $\ell = e$ or μ),
- $\not{E}_T > 100$ GeV and
- $n(b - jet) = 0$.

$m^2_{\tau\tau}$

$Z \to \tau\bar{\tau}j$ is a significant SM BG and earlier studies had proposed $m^2_{\tau\tau} < 0$ cut to reduce this BG. This cut is also used by ATLAS/CMS. $m^2_{\tau\tau}$ is calculated as:

$$m^2_{\tau\tau} = (1+\xi_1)(1+\xi_2)m^2_{\ell\ell} \tag{3}$$

where ξ_1 and ξ_2 are calculated as follows:

$$-\sum_{jets} \vec{p}_T(j) = (1+\xi_1)\vec{p}_T(\ell_1) + (1+\xi_2)\vec{p}_T(\ell_2) \tag{4}$$



Distribution in $m^2_{\tau\tau}$ for three SUSY BM models with $\mu = 150,\ 200$ and 300 GeV along with SM backgrounds after $C1$ cuts with $n_J \geq 1$.

Angle cuts



Sketch of the ditau background, decay products and MET configuration.

$\not{E}_T(tot)$ is expected between the direction of leptons, as long as both τs are fast moving. For a case of very asymmetric τ pair, $\not{E}_T(tot)$ would be close to the fast τ direction. Then mismeasurements can cause $\not{E}_T(tot)$ to be slightly outside the two leptons, motivating the strip cuts.

Angle cuts:

veto ϕ_1, $\phi_2 > 0$, $\phi_1 + \phi_2 < \pi/2$,

veto $|\phi_1| \leq \pi/10$ and $\phi_2 \geq -\pi/10$ or $|\phi_2| \leq \pi/10$ and $\phi_1 \geq -\pi/10$. [strip cuts]

Angle cuts



SUSY BM point $\mu = 150$ GeV



SM BG $\tau\tau j$



SM BG $t\bar{t}$

$m^2_{\tau\tau}$ vs. new angular cuts

cuts/process	$BM1$	$BM2$	$BM3$ $_{GMM'}$	$\tau\bar{\tau}j$	$t\bar{t}$	WWj	$W\ell\bar{\ell}j$	$Z\ell\bar{\ell}j$
BC	83.1	9.3	31.3	43849.0	41426.8	9861.8	1153.0	310.7
$C1$	1.2	0.19	0.07	94.2	179.1	35.9	14.7	5.9
$C1 + m^2_{\tau\tau} < 0$	0.92	0.13	0.043	23.1	75.6	12.8	7.7	3.2
$C1 + angle$	0.69	0.12	0.04	2.2	130.2	22.1	11.0	4.9

Table: Cross sections (in fb) for signal benchmark points and the various SM backgrounds listed in the text after various cuts.

This shows that the angle cuts reduce the $\tau\tau j$ BG more efficiently than the $m^2_{\tau\tau}$ cut, though the more of the other SM BGs get through. We impose further cuts, namely **C2** and **C3**, to reduce the other SM BGs.

Distributions after C1+Angle cuts



$n(jets)$ distribution $\longrightarrow n(jets) = 1$



$p_T(\ell_2)$ distribution $\longrightarrow p_T(\ell_2) : 5 - 15$ GeV



$\not{E}_T / H_T(\ell\bar{\ell})$ distribution $\longrightarrow \not{E}_T / H_T(\ell\bar{\ell}) > 4$

Distributions after C1+Angle cuts



$H_T(\ell\bar{\ell})$ distribution $\longrightarrow H_T(\ell\bar{\ell}) < 60$ GeV



$m(\ell\bar{\ell})$ distribution $\longrightarrow m(\ell\bar{\ell}) < 50$ GeV

In light of the above distributions, we next include the following cut set **C2**:

- **C1** plus angle cuts
- $p_T(\ell_2) : 5 - 15$ GeV
- $\not{E}_T / H_T(\ell\bar{\ell}) > 4$,
- $n(jets) = 1$
- $H_T(\ell\bar{\ell}) < 60$ GeV
- $m(\ell\bar{\ell}) < 50$ GeV

Distributions after C2 cuts



$\Delta\phi(j1, \not{E}_T)$ distribution $\longrightarrow$ $\Delta\phi(j1, \not{E}_T) > 2.2$



$p_T(j1)/\not{E}_T$ distribution $\longrightarrow$ $p_T(j1)/\not{E}_T < 1.5$



$m_{cT}(\ell\bar{\ell}, \not{E}_T)$ distribution $\longrightarrow$ $m_{cT}(\ell\bar{\ell}, \not{E}_T) < 100$ GeV

Distributions after C2 cuts



$|p_T(j1) - \not{E}_T|$ distribution $\longrightarrow$ $|p_T(j1) - \not{E}_T| < 100$ GeV

In light of the above distributions, we next include the following cut set **C3**:

- apply all **C2** cuts,
- $\Delta\phi(j1, \not{E}_T) > 2.2$
- $m_{cT}(\ell\bar{\ell}, \not{E}_T) < 100$ GeV
- $p_T(j1)/\not{E}_T < 1.5$
- $|p_T(j1) - \not{E}_T| < 100$ GeV

Cut flow table

cuts/process	$BM1$	$BM2$	$BM3$ $_{GMM'}$	$\tau\bar{\tau}j$	$t\bar{t}$	WWj	$W\ell\bar{\ell}j$	$Z\ell\bar{\ell}j$
BC	83.1	9.3	31.3	43849.0	41426.8	9861.8	1153.0	310.7
$C1$	1.2	0.19	0.07	94.2	179.1	35.9	14.7	5.9
$C1 + m^2_{\tau\tau} < 0$	0.92	0.13	0.043	23.1	75.6	12.8	7.7	3.2
$C1 + angle$	0.69	0.12	0.04	2.2	130.2	22.1	11.0	4.9
$C2$	0.29	0.049	0.019	0.13	0.99	0.49	0.18	0.14
$C3$	0.25	0.033	0.017	0.13	0.29	0.39	0.15	0.07

Table: Cross sections (in fb) for signal benchmark points and the various SM backgrounds listed in the text after various cuts.

Distributions after C3 cuts



$m(\ell\bar{\ell})$ distribution for BM1 ($\Delta m = 12$ GeV)



$m(\ell\bar{\ell})$ distribution for BM2 ($\Delta m = 15$ GeV)



$m(\ell\bar{\ell})$ distribution for BM3 ($\Delta m = 4.3$ GeV)

Mass reach after C3 + $m(\ell\bar{\ell}) \leq \Delta m$ cuts



$\Delta m = 4$ GeV



$\Delta m = 8$ GeV



$\Delta m = 12$ GeV



$\Delta m = 16$ GeV

Summary plot



The 5σ and 95% CL reach of LHC with 300 and 3000 fb^{-1} in the μ vs. Δm plane after $C3 + m(\ell\bar{\ell}) \leq \Delta m$ cuts.

Conclusion

- Naturalness require the higgsino mass parameter $\mu \sim m_{weak}$ but allow the other soft terms (which are pulled to large values by string landscape) to be large such that sparticles other than higgsinos are well beyond HL-LHC reach.
- Such a stringy naturalness picture provides strong motivation for higgsino pair production reactions as an avenue to SUSY discovery at LHC14.
- Here, we re-examine higgsino pair production reactions leading to soft opposite-sign/same flavor dilepton pairs $+ \not{E}_T$ at LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV.
- We propose a new set of angular cuts which eliminate ditau backgrounds much more efficiently than $m^2_{\tau\tau} < 0$ cut. Several other cuts have been devised to further reduce the other SM backgrounds and yield a clean signal.

- After the final set of cuts, namely the **C3** cuts, we expect higgsino pair production to manifest itself as a low end excess in the $m(\ell\bar{\ell})$ distribution with a cutoff at the $\Delta m = m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ value.
- Therefore, after the **C3** cuts we impose a cut of requiring $m(\ell\bar{\ell}) \leq \Delta m$ and evaluate the reach of LHC14 for 300 and 3000 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity.
- We see that the reach is strongest for larger Δm values up to $15 - 20$ GeV but drops off for smaller mass gaps.
- However, some significant portion of natural parameter space with $\mu \sim m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} \sim 200 - 350$ GeV and $\Delta m \sim 4 - 10$ GeV can still be evaded by HL-LHC.

Thank You

Questions ?

Back Up Slides

Where are the sparticles ?



Results of ATLAS searches for gluino pair production in SUSY for various simplified models with up to 139 fb^{-1} of data at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV.



Results of CMS searches for top squark pair production in SUSY for various simplified models with up to 137 fb^{-1} of data at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV.

Naturalness

$$m_{sparticles} >> m_{SMparticles}$$

LHC Limits: $m_{\tilde{g}} > 2.2$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{t}_1} > 1.3$ TeV $\Longrightarrow$ **Is SUSY Unnatural?**

Various notions of Naturalness found in literature include : Δ_{BG}, Δ_{HS} and Δ_{EW}.

Δ_{HS} and Δ_{BG} measure put a stringent upper bound on the masses of the sparticles. Hence, these notions of naturalness, along with the above-mentioned experimental limits, render weak scale SUSY unnatural/highly fine-tuned.

However, a critical assessment of these older measures of Naturalness reveal that they must be updated to the model-independent electroweak measure of Naturalness (Δ_{EW}) so as to follow the notion of *Practical Naturalness* which states that

> *An Observable $\mathcal{O}$ is natural if all independent contributions to $\mathcal{O}$ are comparable to or less than $\mathcal{O}$.*

Δ_{EW}

A more conservative measure of Naturalness is the Electroweak fine-tuning parameter (Δ_{EW}) which is defined as

$$\Delta_{EW} = max_i|C_i|/(M_Z^2/2) \tag{5}$$

Where, C_i is any one of the parameters on the RHS of the following equation :

$$\frac{M_Z^2}{2} \approx -m_{H_u}^2 - \mu^2 - \Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2}) \tag{6}$$

Since all the terms on RHS of Eqn. 6 must be comparable to $M_Z^2/2$, it implies

- $\mu \leq 300$ GeV $\Longrightarrow$ Light higgsinos.
- top squarks must be highly mixed

Understanding Δ_{EW}



Top ten contributions to $\Delta_{EW} = max_i|C_i|/(M_Z^2/2)$ from NUHM2 model benchmark points with $\mu = 150$, 250, 350 and 450 GeV.

arXiv: 1702.06588 by Baer, Barger, Gainer, Huang, Savoy, Serce and Tata.

Radiatively-Driven Natural SUSY



Evolution of the term $sign(m^2_{H_u})\sqrt{m^2_{H_u}}$ for the case of $No\ EWSB$, criticality as in RNS and $m_{weak} = 3$ TeV.

arXiv: 1602.07697 by Baer, Barger, Savoy and Serce.